

THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Twenty-Fifth Meeting, Addis Ababa (Ethiopia), 24 February - 3 March 1981

THE ROLE OF TAC AND ITS PROGRAMME OF WORK IN 1981

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT

(Agenda Item 4)

Proposed objectives of the discussion

- (i) To re-examine the role of TAC in the light of recent developments, in particular as regards that of the Boards of Trustees (see the statement of the Chairmen of the Boards of Trustees in Annex I), to elaborate earlier statements on this subject and/or to propose amendments to TAC's terms of reference, as a contribution of the Committee to the ongoing review of the CGIAR.
- (ii) To develop further the working procedures of TAC<sup>1/</sup> in relation to other components of the CGIAR system, in particular as regards the review of priorities, the formulation of new initiatives and follow-up of TAC's recommendations.
- (iii) To formulate TAC's programme of work and timetable for 1981 and 1982. It is proposed to give priority to the plant nutrition study, that on plant breeders' rights and the water management proposal for consideration by the Group on 1981. Progress in other fields will continue for submission of findings to the Group in 1982.

1/ N.B. The procedures for examining the programmes and budgets of the Centres are proposed to be dealt with under Agenda Item 10.

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

January 1981

# THE ROLE OF TAC AND ITS PROGRAMME OF WORK IN 1981

## NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT

### (1) Introduction and background

1. At its 23rd meeting, TAC had with the help of a working group a long discussion on its role and working procedures, based on a series of notes prepared by members and by the Secretariat. The proceedings and the outcome of this discussion were recorded in the minutes 1/ of the 23rd meeting and TAC decided to keep the matter under review at future meetings.

2. During the course of 1980, TAC faced a number of difficulties in playing the role and in following the procedures it had set for itself. Some of the problems related specifically to its examination of the P&Bs of the Centres. These are proposed to be discussed as a separate agenda item. With the more stringent financial conditions which developed in 1980, more basic questions were raised also as regards the respective roles of TAC, the CGIAR donors, individually and collectively, and the Boards of Trustees of the Centres in setting priorities among ongoing activities and new initiatives. This prompted the presentation of a collective statement by the Chairmen of the Boards of Trustees at the last CGIAR meeting. Copy of this statement, which was supported by the Centre Directors, is attached as Annex I of this document.

3. Several recommendations of TAC as regards new initiatives (e.g. ICIPE, water management) did not meet with the full support of the Group and some were referred back to the Committee for further study with different approaches. Meanwhile the Group was informed of the difficulties which the Committee had in reconsidering its earlier recommendations on IFDC in the broader context of the overall plant nutrition research requirements. Some donors regretted the limited progress made by TAC in this field.

4. It is legitimate for TAC to ask itself whether the solution of these difficulties would require further adjustments in its functions and procedures and/or in those of other components of the CGIAR system (the Group, its Secretariat, the Boards of Trustees).

- (2) The role of TAC as stated at the 23rd meeting and by its terms of reference

5. TAC at its 23rd meeting considered its terms of reference (see para 6 below) and came to the following conclusion as regards its role:

*"The role of TAC should remain primarily advisory and its members should continue to serve on a part-time basis. As an independent advisory body to the CGIAR, TAC should continue to focus its attention on the overall priorities for agricultural research in developing countries, and on the general pattern of resource allocation by the Group and the effectiveness of their use in relation to these priorities, including those for new initiatives. It should maintain sufficient surveillance of the IARC programmes to be in a position to advise and assure the CGIAR on the appropriateness, relevance, and scientific quality of the IARC programmes." 1/*

6. The Committee may wish to consider whether the above statement would require amendments or additions in the light of the statement by the Chairmen of the Board of Trustees, presented in Annex I and of further discussions. Alternatively, TAC may propose amendments or additions to its terms of reference, which are as follows:

*"The TAC will, acting either upon reference from the Consultative Group or on its own initiative:*

- (i) advise the Consultative Group on the main gaps and priorities in agricultural research related to the problems of the developing countries, both in the technical and socio-economic fields, based on a continuing review of existing national, regional and international research activities;*
- (ii) recommend to the Consultative Group feasibility studies designed to explore in depth how best to organize and conduct agricultural research on priority problems, particularly those calling for international or regional efforts;*
- (iii) examine the results of these or other feasibility studies and present its views and recommendations for action for the guidance of the Consultative Group;*

---

1/ Other recommendations were made at this meeting regarding the role of TAC as regards P&Bs and long-term plans of IARCs (paras 44-45 of the Report of the 23rd Meeting).

- (iv) *advise the Consultative Group on the effectiveness of specific existing international research programmes; and*
- (v) *in other ways encourage the creation of an international network of research institutions and the effective interchange of information among them".*

(3) Main points suggested for further consideration of working procedures

7. The Secretariat has identified several points which appear to deserve further attention by the Committee. The Committee may wish to amend and/or expand this list and take into account any further questions which the Study Team for the CGIAR Review would have in this respect.

(3.1) The review of priorities by TAC

8. TAC issued three successive versions of its "priority paper". In addition, TAC reviewed on an ad hoc basis certain priority areas as part of the programme it had set for itself in the last version of its priority paper and/or on request of the CGIAR (e.g. plant nutrition, pest management). Several IARCs have under preparation or have already prepared long-term plans, as well as reviews of priorities in certain areas (CIAT on Amazon Basin, IRRI on soils constraints, etc.). Some donors make concurrently reviews of their priorities (e.g. DSE/GTZ/BMZ/RF for the Federal Republic of Germany, SAREC in Sweden, the NAS of the USA) or plan to do so (e.g. Australia in tropical pastures). The Co-sponsors also issue periodically reviews and prospective studies (e.g. FAO on Agriculture towards 2000, Energy vs. Food Production).

*TAC may wish to examine how best it can make use of diverse inputs in advising the CGIAR on priorities and where it has a special role and comparative advantage as related to those of the Boards of Trustees and CG donors individually and collectively. It may also wish to examine the case when its advice on priorities would not meet with the consensus of the CGIAR.*

(3.2) The consideration and/or formulation of new initiatives

9. TAC has so far considered that it should not merely identify priority areas for new initiatives, but also play an active role itself in formulating proposals for the consideration by the Group, or in reshaping proposals submitted by others. In one case, however, (ISNAR) the Group established its own task force to formulate a proposal. In other cases TAC used diverse mechanisms to assist in the formulation of proposals (consultants, roving panels of experts, subcommittees of TAC, expert consultations, etc.).

TAC used several of these mechanisms in trying to elaborate a proposal in such fields as water management, aquaculture and tropical vegetables. It seems, therefore, that the role which TAC itself has played in this regard and its procedures varied with the circumstances and the subject matter considered.

10. One of the problems faced by TAC in the formulation of new initiatives is to mobilize the expertise available in a certain field, while avoiding the biases of the subject matter specialists, and recognizing their frequent ties with interested institutions. It appears, however, that the main difficulty experienced by the Committee was not in specific subject matter areas, but rather in devising an acceptable institutional machinery, a field in which TAC may claim a particular competence being mainly composed of research administrators, but where the views of interested governments, donor institutions and other organizations within the CGIAR and outside are equally important.

*TAC may therefore wish to re-examine its specific role and its procedures in the process of formulation of new initiatives by the CGIAR. In addition, TAC will have further discussions on institutional alternatives under a separate item of the agenda of this meeting.*

### (3.3) Follow-up and implementation of TAC recommendations

11. In principle, the recommendations which TAC makes as an advisory body are addressed to the Consultative Group and not directly to the Boards of Trustees or the Directors of the Centres. The Consultative Group by its very nature does not formally adopt or reject TAC recommendations, but may endorse them or not.

12. When these recommendations relate to new initiatives by the Group, the implications of the endorsement are clear and are followed by further steps taken directly by the Group (e.g. the CG committee and executing agency for the establishment of ISNAR or the financing of an existing institution through the Group). When the Group does not endorse a recommendation of TAC for a new initiative, individual donors may still feel free to follow TAC's advice and take appropriate action outside the Group. The Group may also refer the proposal back to TAC for further study. In this case, however, the informal summary of proceedings of the CGIAR is perhaps not the most efficient vehicle for conveying the observations of CGIAR members to TAC, since the reasons for the non-endorsement of a proposal may vary from one member to another and be technical, financial or political.

13. When dealing with ongoing activities supported by the Group, the follow-up and implementation of TAC's recommendations does not involve the CGIAR and its individual members to the same extent as for new

initiatives. Some recommendations are taken up directly by the CGIAR Secretariat, which in turn may recommend to the CGIAR certain related adjustments in the level of the budgets of the Centres. Other recommendations from TAC, which do not have immediate and specific budgetary implications, but relate to the programme of the Centres, are merely reported to the Group. These are rarely discussed, formally endorsed or even noted. In these conditions the roles which TAC, the Secretariats and the Boards of Trustees should play respectively in the follow-up of recommendations which do not have a formal endorsement by the Group are much less clear.

*It is therefore suggested to discuss whether the Committee, the Secretariats and the Boards of Trustees should receive from the Group more definite mandates respectively, as regards the implementation of TAC recommendations.*

14. The usual procedure in ensuring the follow-up of recommendations is to seek periodic reports on their implementation. In the first place, these reports should be examined by the Board of Trustees of the Centre concerned. TAC and the CGIAR could then be informed by the respective Secretariats when delays or discrepancies occur in the implementation and, in such cases, TAC after further consultation with the Centre concerned, may further advise the CGIAR in this respect.

(4) Secretariat proposals for the programme of the Committee in 1981

(4.1) Review of priorities and forward planning for the CGIAR system as a whole

15. TAC has embarked on several studies aiming at re-examining priorities in such fields as plant nutrition, pest management, water management, aquaculture, tropical vegetables, but did not reach the stage where the overall priorities could be re-examined in the light of the findings of these studies. Some new assessments of agricultural research priorities have also been carried out by others, since TAC produced the third version of the priority paper. These do not seem to call for significant modifications of TAC recommendations on priorities for international support to agricultural research within the framework of the CGIAR system.

16. TAC, however, has made important progress not only in assessing priorities between subject areas, but also in examining the relative importance of different modes and alternatives in implementing the CGIAR objectives (e.g. sub-contracting). Further discussion will take place during this meeting under a separate agenda item. This activity should give an important input to the CGIAR Review.

17. At the last meeting of the CGIAR in Manila, several donors expressed reservations on the proposed financial plan of the Group for the next five years. This plan made provision for one new initiative to be taken by the Group each year, while ensuring further growth of some of the ongoing activities. The figures in the Indicative Plan presented in the 1980 Integrative Report were finally retained as a target. The Group, however, wished to consider at its next meeting alternative financial plans based on different assumptions as to the availability of funds. *The Committee may wish to discuss the ways and means by which it should contribute to the formulation of alternative financial plans for the CGIAR system. These plans should also take into account the recommendations of TAC on the priorities of the CGIAR system as well as the individual long-term plans prepared by the IARCs when available.*

(4.2) Formulation of proposals for new initiatives

18. Taking into account the present trends in the financial plans of the CGIAR, it would seem unrealistic for the Committee to finalize and submit more than one proposal for a new initiative at the next meeting of the CGIAR in November 1981.

19. *Five proposals or priority areas are at present at various stages of elaboration and discussion: (a) water management, (b) tropical vegetables, (c) aquaculture, (d) plant nutrition, (e) pest management. The Secretariat suggests that TAC should:*

- (i) aim at finalizing a proposal on water management and a report on priorities on plant nutrition research for consideration by the Group in November 1981;*
- (ii) continue its consideration of other priority areas with the help of consultants and/or working groups as appropriate, with a view to presenting to the Group progress reports in November 1981 and its findings and recommendations in 1982.*

(4.3) Other activities

20. *It is proposed that the consideration of the programme and budget proposals of the Centres be carried out through several steps from this meeting to the next (see documentation on Agenda Item 10).*

21. *In addition, TAC should hopefully carry out a study on plant breeders' rights, both at this meeting and jointly with the Centre Directors at the 26th meeting. Finally, TAC should at its next June meeting give its views on the draft preliminary findings and recommendations of the CGIAR Review.*

Statement of the Chairmen of Boards of Trustees

CGIAR Meeting, Manila, Philippines 27-31 October 1980

THE INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS  
BOARDS OF TRUSTEESThe Role and Responsibilities of the Boards of Trustees of the IARC's

The role of the Boards of Trustees of the International Agricultural Research Centers has been evolving steadily since the inauguration of the Consultative Group. Originally, Boards were primarily concerned with the internal operations of their Centers and relations with Donors but the emergence of a variety of external influences and institutions emanating from the Consultative Group is having a clear impact on the management of the Centers and, therefore, on the Boards of Trustees.

These factors have caused the Chairmen of the Boards to dedicate substantial effort during the past two years to an evaluation of the role of their Boards for the purpose of carrying out any adjustments in their methods of operation which might be necessary. This paper sets out the conclusions which have been reached and some agreed principles upon which the conduct of the Boards of Trustees should be based.

I. The Role of a Board Within a Center

An analysis of the role of Boards of Trustees requires that a Center be viewed in two ways: first, as an independent scientific institution carrying out research for the benefit of developing countries with the financial support of a specific group of donors and second, as a component in the Consultative Group system with its increasing variety of Centers and rapidly growing competition for funds.

The traditional responsibilities and functions of the Boards of Trustees are related directly to the first concept of a Center and are described in its basic Charter. The Board is the governing body of the Center and is responsible for all strategy and policy decisions as well as for approving the programs, budgets and financing agreements needed to carry them out.

The execution of the Board's decisions and the management of the Center itself are, of course, the domain and responsibility of the Director-General and his staff. Consequently, the selection of the Director-General is a decision of fundamental importance for the success of the Board of Trustees and of the Center.

The relationship which exists in a well managed Center between the Board and the Director-General is a symbiotic one in which the Board depends on the Chief Executive for dynamic and visionary leadership while he looks to the Board for authority, direction, advice and support. The Board can normally in this situation concentrate on being well informed and responsive in a critical but positive manner to the initiatives and proposals of the Director-General. It is only when that leadership is deficient in some respect that a Board must consider exercising authority independently by taking its own corrective



initiatives. However, except in these unusual circumstances, there is no doubt that the successful management of a Center depends on a positive, interdependent and mutually respectful relationship between the Board and the senior management.

The Trustees themselves have tended in the past to give greater emphasis to the research aspects of a Center's activities because most of them had scientific backgrounds and because the most urgent issue was the search for solutions to the food problem. Financial and institutional matters, except for budget approval, were usually left to the Director-General.

In recent years, however, there has been a clear trend toward more active involvement in these issues by Boards of Trustees. This has resulted from the program and budget growth and the attendant need to give greater consideration to management and financial policies. Moreover, there has been some broadening of the composition of Boards to include social scientists and managers which has improved their capacity to review such matters. Nevertheless, the maintenance of the quality and relevance of the research program continues properly to be the highest priority of the Boards of Trustees.

In addition to the diversification of the interests of the Boards, the frequency and intensity of their participation in the management process continue to grow as well. Program and Executive Committees have become common elements of a Board's structure and have permitted Trustees to make contributions in the manner which best suits their expertise. There seems little doubt, however, that even more active participation by the Boards will become necessary in order to carry out successfully an expanded policy and review role. Among the most probable changes will be more frequent meetings of Executive Committees and full Boards in order to deal with the policy problems that might arise from limitations of funding.

The clearest implication of this trend is that Trustees and particularly the officers of a Board will be required to devote more time and effort to their functions which has been a problem for many Trustees whose other responsibilities are very demanding. As a result, a nucleus of each Board has frequently carried out the major part of its activities. An increased demand on time will undoubtedly further complicate this situation. Consequently, it will be essential to improve the system of appointment of Trustees so that the increased roles of the Boards can be shared by a greater number of Trustees who are both willing and capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of the position. The most important need will be to broaden the range and variety of candidates so that a Board can choose its members from a larger and more diversified group of nominees.

## II. Relations With Donors

The Boards of Trustees are independently and legally responsible for the performance of the Centers and have not been formally accountable to external agencies. Nevertheless, they are morally responsible both to the donors and beneficiaries of the Centers for the quality of research, of management and of the use of contributed funds.

This responsibility has tended to be demonstrated implicitly in the reporting function of the Boards but the growing concern about the funding of the Centers has made it increasingly necessary for them to be sure that donors are even better informed about the operations and performance of the Centers. It is not always possible under current circumstances for the Centers to achieve that objective because of the inadequacy of opportunities for dialogues between donors and Centers.

There already exists broad range of reports about programs and budgets which provide in considerable detail the basic information about the activities of each Center. The Boards and Managements carry out regular in depth reviews and evaluations of the programs of their Centers through their Program and Finance Committees. They identify the strengths and weaknesses of programs and determine any corrective measures which might be needed.

The Boards of Trustees believe that donors would find that the internal program and management reviews are generally critical and demanding, and provide more than adequate level of program supervision. It is worth stressing that these reviews are carried out by highly qualified specialists in the fields of activity of each Center and that by virtue of their knowledge of the programs, they should be the most competent judges of their quality and effectiveness. However, in order to give them even greater value, annual Program Committee reviews might also include the participation of outside experts as is done in some Centers already. Members of the Consultative Group would then have access to independent critical opinions of program performance.

In addition to these internal reviews and reports on the operations of each Center, there are periodic external evaluations by such institutions as the TAC and the CG Secretariat. The value of these reviews to the donors and the Centers depends very much on their quality and on the knowledge of the evaluators. Generally speaking, they have been constructive and useful to the Centers but the Boards believe that their utility to donors and beneficiaries would be enhanced if the responses by the Boards of Trustees and the managements were also taken into account. This has rarely been the case in the past and has resulted in leaving out of consideration the most informed opinions.

The Boards consider that the most glaring weakness of the existing situation is the lack of opportunity for the Centers to present and discuss their programs in depth with their donors and beneficiaries so that the wealth of internal information and evaluation can be made fully available. Centers Week no longer provides an adequate vehicle for such exchanges but it would clearly be the most convenient opportunity if an improved format can be devised. It would then be possible for the members of the CG to participate in discussion among the Directors-General, the Chairmen of Boards, the TAC and the Secretariats about the programs of the Centers.

The Boards attach great importance to improving the flow of information between the Centers and their donors because the main external relationship of a Center has been with them and the maintenance of confidence in the Centers depend in part on being able to show that they are managing their programs and resources in a competent manner.

### III. Relations With the Consultative Group

The ability of the Boards of Trustees to demonstrate to the members of the CG that the Centers are being responsibly managed has become somewhat more complicated by the increasing degree of formal organization of the Consultative Group system. This is not unexpected as the system becomes more complex and the financial requirements reach substantial levels but the Boards are concerned that this trend not undermine the successful direct relationships between Centers and donors which have characterized the system during its first decade or the creative research environments within the Centers.

The existing situation has arisen from the tendency of the CG to look progressively to its own institutions, the TAC and the CG Secretariat, for policy papers as well as program evaluations. The Centers appreciate the need for such valuable supporting and advisory services but are concerned about the trend toward the use of the CG bodies as intermediaries between the Group itself and the Centers. This has resulted in limiting the contributions of the Centers to the Consultative Group which might be well served by hearing the views of the Centers on strategy and policy issues as well as program matters.

At the present time, the Centers have limited opportunity to participate actively in the various deliberations of the Consultative Group. During Centers Week, they can make brief and superficial presentations of their programs but are not able to contribute to the discussions concerning strategy and priorities. The Boards of Trustees, being aware of the knowledge that the Centers possess about virtually all of the significant issues before the Group, feel that the Group's decisions could be materially assisted by an active role by the Centers in their consideration. Moreover, these decisions would then have much greater significance to the Centers which are responsible for their implementation.

There is no doubt about the need for the coordination function and the essential role of the Secretariats in carrying it out. This is as true in the case of program coordination by the TAC as in the case of the CG Secretariat in financial matters. The complexity of this task is recognized as is the contribution to the Centers which the TAC and the Secretariats have made. However, the Boards do believe that the pragmatic evolution of the CG system has produced some important uncertainties in the relationships among the Centers, the donors and the Secretariats which require clarification.

One such issue is the coordination of budget preparation and resource allocation. This was not a controversial task until recent differences between the financial needs of the Centers and available funding gave rise to the need for more careful budgeting and priority setting. The TAC and CG Secretariat have played a very active role on behalf of the donors in balancing budgets and funding to the extent of determining budget levels for the Centers and specific areas for reduced funding.

This development is a cause of special concern to the Boards because it is eroding their fundamentally important responsibility for the approval of the programs and budgets of the Centers. They fully accept the need for budget adjustments if sufficient funds are not available for each Center but they

cannot accept externally determined changes in approved programs and budgets. The Boards are not only formally responsible for that decision but are also the most competent body to determine the adjustments which might be necessary in the face of shortfalls in funding. As a minimum, they must have the opportunity to review and approve any proposed changes and, if they are not acceptable, to request a reconsideration of the amount of funding by the Center's own donors or the CG. Without this right, the real power of program and budget approval passes, de facto, to the Secretariats and to the Consultative Group. Moreover, the Centers would lose the direct relationships with their donors which has been a fundamental principle of the Consultative Group concept and which permits donors to support the Centers which satisfy their individual priorities in agricultural research.

It is worth emphasizing that the single most difficult aspect of the budget adjustment process is the determination of the amount by which each Center's proposed budget should be reduced to accommodate the total available funds. At the present time, there exists no agreed formula so that changes have had to be made somewhat arbitrarily through awkward and difficult negotiations between the Secretariats and the Directors-General. This problem would be minimized to a considerable extent by having the clearest possible guidelines from the CG concerning probable availabilities of funds during budget preparation so that realistic ceilings can be used. Subsequently, it will be essential to establish criteria by which budget adjustments can be identified so that the Boards of Trustees and managements of the Centers can present to the Consultative Group budgets which are realistic and responsive to the strategies and programs of the system as a whole.

The Boards of Trustees realize that it would be difficult for the Boards or the donors themselves to carry out all the needed coordination. Boards can require that the Directors-General report specifically on program coordination with other Centers and can take actively into account the reports and comments of the TAC and the strategy and priority decisions of the CG. The Chairmen of the Boards can and do discuss this issue during their periodic consultations so that there is a continuing awareness of the importance of program coordination. In an environment of insufficient financing, there is clearly good reason for Boards of Trustees to avoid costly duplication of effort and futile insistence on budget levels that cannot be financed.

However, the Boards of Trustees could not willingly accept a conversion of the international coordination function into one of centralized management and of the Consultative Group into a Governing Body of the system. Many countries have had unfortunate experiences with the centralized control of research even when knowledgeable and well intentioned administrators exercise that responsibility. The difficulty of that task would be compounded in the case of the International Agricultural Research Centers by the geographic as well as scientific diversity of the Centers and by the fact that they are legally constituted under the laws of a number of different nations.

The most potent defense of the original decentralized concept of the Consultative Group is that the great variety of technically complex activities of the Centers is best oriented, supervised, and evaluated by responsible Boards of Trustees at each Center which are expert in a given field and which are

also responsive to the collective needs of the donors who support the Centers and the recipients who benefit from them. If Boards of Trustees are perceived as not adequately carrying out that responsibility in some manner, the solution is to correct those deficiencies: this has been the intent of the Board Chairmen in their own review exercise.

#### IV. Conclusion

The Boards of Trustees clearly have an interest in maintaining and improving the Consultative Group system and their own role within it. They believe that their contributions to the scientific aspects of the operations of the Centers have been and will continue to be productive and that their participation in financial and operational affairs is achieving the same standards. They are taking the necessary steps to be able to carry out a broader role and look to the CG for support in finding the type of qualified Trustees who can participate in an active Board.

The Boards of Trustees accept the need to be more aware of and responsive to the concerns of their own donors and of the Consultative Group as a whole in addition to their own fundamental concerns about the quality of research and its relevance to the food production problems of the developing countries. It is the objective of the Boards that the members of the Consultative Group look to the Boards of Trustees for the basic critical and objective evaluations of the scientific and management performance of the Centers and to the Secretariats for specific reviews of issues of interest to the CG.

The Boards of Trustees will be better informed about the Consultative Group and its concerns by the Chairmen and Directors-General. The Chairmen themselves will continue to devote more time and attention to matters relating to the Consultative Group through a more formal and active process of mutual consultation. During Centers Week, the Boards of Trustees believe that a more active participation by the Centers in Consultative Group deliberations would be very beneficial to the Group and to the Centers.

The Boards of Trustees consider that the Decennial Review of the Consultative Group with its emphasis on management issues will provide an excellent opportunity to clarify the roles and relationships of the various participants in the system. The Boards of Trustees have already benefited by preparing themselves for the review through a process of critical self evaluation by their Chairmen which has resulted in a clearer and broader concept of their role and responsibilities within the CG system. They are ready to contribute to the Decennial Review in the most appropriate manner and will continue to contribute to the success of the Consultative Group concept by carrying out their own responsibilities to the Centers and the donors who are the cornerstones of the International Agricultural Research system.

Charles T. Greenwood  
Chairman  
Group of Board Chairmen